



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,482	12/21/2001	Janet A. Warrington	3445	2372
22886	7590	10/18/2004		
AFFYMETRIX, INC ATTN: CHIEF IP COUNSEL, LEGAL DEPT. 3380 CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY SANTA CLARA, CA 95051				
			EXAMINER SMITH, CAROLYN L	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,482

Applicant(s)

WARRINGTON ET AL.

Examiner

Carolyn L Smith

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 15-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 15-18, 20, 22 and 26 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 19, 21, 23-25 and 27 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments and remarks, filed 6/10/04, are acknowledged. Amended claims 1, 4, 15-16, and 18-25 are acknowledged.

Applicant's arguments, filed 6/10/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-4 and 15-27 are herein under examination.

Claim Objections

Claim 1, line 15, is objected to because of the following informality: The term "data" is in plural form so that the word "is" should be changed to the plural form as well. Appropriate correction is required. This objection is necessitated by amendment.

Claims Rejected Under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

LACK OF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Art Unit: 1631

Amended claims 15, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is necessitated by amendment.

While support in the specification is provided for two laboratory personnel to sample, hybridize, and analyze 40 arrays per day, there does not appear to be support for the phrase “8 hour” work day, as stated in claims 15 and 16. While the specification on page 30, lines 10-15, provides support for simultaneous screening of 30 kb of sense and 30 kb of antisense DNA, it does not support the phrase “about” 30 kilobases, as stated in amended claim 16 and twice in amended claim 22. Because the introduction of “about” (claims 16 and 22) and “8 hour work” day (claims 15 and 16), filed 6/10/04, does not appear to have support in the specification, these phrases are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being NEW MATTER. This rejection is necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for

Art Unit: 1631

patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 17-18, 20, and 26 is necessitated by amendment under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(1) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (2001/0039014 A1).

Bass et al. disclose automated devices and systems for arraying nucleic acids and for making and copying arrays, for performing in vitro translation and/or transcription of nucleic acid libraries, and for screening (abstract and paragraph 0002). Bass et al. disclose automated systems to assess biological phenomena including gene expression levels in response to stimuli (high throughput DNA genotyping), as well as integrated systems for performing mixing experiments (sample preparation method), DNA amplification (PCR), and DNA sequencing (genotyping) (paragraph 0003). Figure 13 shows a DNA fragment preparation device (paragraph 0111). Bass et al. disclose nucleic acid fragments are optionally contacted in a single pool or in multiple pools (paragraphs 0018 and 0058) which represents pooling aliquots of a plurality of amplicons into a plurality of pooled samples, as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose laboratory attempts to meet increased demand for product development and research with minimal use of laboratory personnel (paragraph 0003). Bass et al. disclose using a nucleic acid shuffling module to dispense elongated nucleic acids into one or more multiwell plates (paragraph 0019) which represents an automated high density probe array loader, as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose automated systems with robotics and fluid handling modules such as for microtiter tray manipulation (paragraph 0006) which is reasonably interpreted to be a sample preparation automation system, as stated in instant claims 1 and 2. Bass et al. disclose

Art Unit: 1631

samples can be treated with at least one disruptive physical condition, such as freeze-thawing, cold-hot cycling (paragraph 0573) which represents the presence of a refrigerated unit, as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose using a microamplifier in which DNA is placed in a microcapillary and moved through three resistors whose temperatures are programmed (paragraph 0550). Bass et al. disclose using a robotic arm to move the capillary (paragraph 0550). As these modules are part of an integrated system (Figures 1A to 7), the temperature treatment and robotic arm microamplifier are connected with the nucleic acid shuffling module representing the probe array loader, as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose using devices and systems using an array of reaction mixtures that include one or more diversified nucleic acids (i.e. mutagenized or transcribed mutagenized) (paragraph 0010) which represent variation detection (an automated high density probe array loader), as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose libraries that involve hybridization to a selected nucleic acid probe (paragraph 0195). Bass et al. disclose using PCR with techniques for rapid genotyping and quantification with hybridization probes (paragraph 0332). Since the probes are for the one or more diversified nucleic acids as described above, these probes represent "about 400,000 different sequence probes", as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose a physical array with a set of specified elements (features) arranged in a specified spatial arrangement and a logical array with a set of specified elements that permits access to the elements of the set (paragraph 0133). As it is well known that there are many features in an array where probes are placed, it is reasonably interpreted that each probe is present in a different feature of the array, as broadly stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose using two probes labeled with different fluorophores that transfer energy between them to become excited and detected if a desired

Art Unit: 1631

genotype is present (paragraphs 0335 and 0336) which also represent “about 400,000 different sequence probes”, as stated in instant claim 1. Bass et al. disclose the devices and integrated systems contain a bar-code sample tracking module which includes a bar code reader and a computer readable database (memory) with bar codes for corresponding arrays (paragraph 0011), as stated in instant claims 1, 3, 17, and 26. Bass et al. disclose data obtained by the detection device is processed, stored, and analyzed by a computer system including a microprocessor and memory (paragraph 0423). Bass et al. disclose using PCR to amplify elongated nucleic acids to produce an amplified array of elongated nucleic acids (paragraph 0019) which represents long range PCR amplification, as stated in instant claim 18. Bass et al. disclose various sources of nucleic acids, including cDNA, DNA generated by reverse transcription, and antisense nucleic acid (paragraph 0020), as stated in instant claim 20. Bass et al. disclose simultaneous addition, cleaving and synthesizing of one or more DNA and antisense nucleic acid (paragraphs 0019 and 0070). Bass et al. disclose using nucleic acid fragments up to about 100 bases (paragraph 0238). Bass et al. disclose a nucleic acid shuffling or mutagenesis module which is preceded by a module which allows overlapping of oligonucleotides to be assembled into multimers (paragraph 0014), which represents tiling. Bass et al. disclose selecting, recombining, and re-arraying one or more members (nucleic acid) of an array (paragraph 0082) which represents a contiguous sequence being tiled on an array. Bass et al. disclose the analysis device allows one to quantitatively measure the frequency of recombination between DNA polymorphisms in parental genes (paragraph 0554). Bass et al. disclose the use of molecular beacons which are probes that can be used in various amplification reactions that report the presence of specific nucleic acids (region of interest), including the detection of single-nucleotide variations (paragraph 0329)

Art Unit: 1631

which represents determining the genotype of a plurality of single nucleotide polymorphisms in a region of interest, as stated in instant claims 1, 4, and 18.

Thus, Bass et al. anticipate the limitations in claims 1-4, 17-18, 20, and 26. This rejection is necessitated by amendment.

Applicants assert that Bass et al. do not disclose a system with a plurality of high density nucleic acid probe arrays. This statement is found unpersuasive as such probe arrays are described in the above description. Applicants assert that a nucleic acid shuffling module does not adequately represent an automated high density array loader. Applicants state a nucleic acid shuffling module dispenses nucleic acids and reaction mixtures into multiwell plates while a high density probe array loader transports arrays. Applicants arguments are found unpersuasive as the phrase "high density array loader" has been broadly as reasonably interpreted due to the fact that Applicants failed to provide an explicit definition of what this phrase was intended to mean. Therefore, a nucleic acid shuffling module dispensing nucleic acids onto plates is a form of a high density array loader.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Claims 19, 21, 23-25, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR §1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn Smith, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0721. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8 A.M. to 6:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner Tina Plunkett whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

John J. V. [unclear] 10/14/04

October 14, 2004